



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,625	06/27/2003	Shelby L. Cook	022956-0214	9377
21125 7590 09/20/2007 NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST 155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD BOSTON, MA 02210-2604			EXAMINER NGUYEN, TUAN VAN	
			ART UNIT 3731	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@nutter.com

ED

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/615,625	COOK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan V. Nguyen	3731	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Tuan V. Nguyen.
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_.
- (2) Ronald E. Cahill (Reg. No. 38,403).
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 10 September 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 19, and 21-25.

Identification of prior art discussed: Donnelley (US 6,773,436) and Pedlick (US 6,270,518).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☐ was not reached.    h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner asserts that suture channel of Donnelley reference read on claims 1 and 19. Pedlick reference still read on claim 1 and also read on new claim 22. With respect to claims 21-22 and 23-25, examiner asserts that claims 21-22 and 23-25 are unpatentable over Donnelley in view of Pedlick.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
**ANH TUAN T. NGUYEN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

2/11/07.  
Examiner's signature, if required